This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Y4.R52:M71
STANFORD LIBRARIES

ILE HARBOR, ALA.

P15-133

HEARINGS

ON THE SUBJECT
OF THE

VEMENT OF MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

HELD BEFORE THE

EE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

CONSISTING OF

JOHN H. SMALL, North Carolina, *Chairman.*

HER, Missouri.
HER, Illinois.
LY, New Jersey.
OR, Arkansas.
RÉ, Louisiana.
xas.
Alabama.
ON, Indiana.
ER, Tennessee.
A, California.
CHARLES A. KENNEDY, Iowa.
ROBERT M. SWITZER, Ohio.
JAMES A. FREAR, Wisconsin.
DOW H. DRUKKER, New Jersey.
PETER E. COSTELLO, Pennsylvania.
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY, New York.
HENRY I. EMERSON, Ohio.
HENRY Z. OSBORNE, California.
RICHARD P. FREEMAN, Connecticut.

FEBRUARY 1, 1918

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1918

Y4.R52:M71

STANFORD LIBRARIES

MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

P15-133

HEARINGS

ON THE SUBJECT
OF THE

IMPROVEMENT OF MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

HELD BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

CONSISTING OF

JOHN H. SMALL, North Carolina, *Chairman.*

CHARLES F. BOOHER, Missouri.
THOMAS GALLAGHER, Illinois.
THOMAS J. SCULLY, New Jersey.
SAMUEL M. TAYLOR, Arkansas.
H. GARLAND DUPRÉ, Louisiana.
MARTIN DIES, Texas.
OSCAR L. GRAY, Alabama.
GEORGE K. DENTON, Indiana.
HUBERT F. FISHER, Tennessee.
CLARENCE F. LEA, California.
CHARLES A. KENNEDY, Iowa.
ROBERT M. SWITZER, Ohio.
JAMES A. FREAR, Wisconsin.
DOW H. DRUKKER, New Jersey.
PETER E. COSTELLO, Pennsylvania.
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY, New York.
HENRY I. EMERSON, Ohio.
HENRY Z. OSBORNE, California.
RICHARD P. FREEMAN, Connecticut.

FEBRUARY 1, 1918

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1918

IMPROVEMENT OF MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Friday, February 1, 1918.

The committee this day met, Hon. John H. Small (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the committee will kindly come to order. This is the morning that we have assigned to a delegation from Mobile, Ala., and we are ready now, Mr. Gray, and I will ask you to kindly take charge and indicate the gentlemen who desire to be heard.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as stated by our chairman, we have before us to-day certain gentlemen from Mobile, representing the commercial bodies of that port, who are to talk to us about the necessity of an increased appropriation for this great harbor upon the Gulf. They have come here under considerable disadvantages; you know something about the weather conditions. In fact, they have come through ice and snow to get here and were about 12 hours belated. They are extremely anxious about this matter, and desire to speak candidly of the real conditions as they are, and of the wonderful developments that have taken place at Mobile since the last engineer's report. These gentlemen are here especially to inform you, and to show you the reasons why Mobile, at this time, should have a greater appropriation than that contemplated and recommended by the Board of Engineers.

I have pleasure in presenting to you the gentlemen who will act as chairman of the Mobile delegation at this meeting to-day. Mr. Stewart Brooks, of Mobile, vice chairman of the joint rivers and harbor committee, who will address you and will present the other members of the delegation who desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear from you, Mr. Brooks.

STATEMENT OF MR. STEWART BROOKS, VICE CHAIRMAN JOINT RIVERS AND HARBOR COMMITTEE, MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we keenly appreciate the opportunity that presents itself to us to-day. We do not wish to take any more of the time of your committee than we have to, and therefore we will not indulge in generalities. The reason I am before you personally is to save time by giving an outline of how we will present our case. We expect, unless you ask questions that will require something else, to ask you to listen to only three technical speakers. We have a delegation of six gentlemen here. One of our

Y4.R52:M71

STANFORD LIBRARIES

MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

P15-133

HEARINGS

ON THE SUBJECT
OF THE

IMPROVEMENT OF MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

HELD BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

CONSISTING OF

JOHN H. SMALL, North Carolina, *Chairman.*

CHARLES F. BOOHER, Missouri.
THOMAS GALLAGHER, Illinois.
THOMAS J. SCULLY, New Jersey.
SAMUEL M. TAYLOR, Arkansas.
H. GARLAND DUPRÉ, Louisiana.
MARTIN DIES, Texas.
OSCAR L. GRAY, Alabama.
GEORGE K. DENTON, Indiana.
HUBERT F. FISHER, Tennessee.
CLARENCE F. LEA, California.
CHARLES A. KENNEDY, Iowa.
ROBERT M. SWITZER, Ohio.
JAMES A. FREAR, Wisconsin.
DOW H. DRUKKER, New Jersey.
PETER E. COSTELLO, Pennsylvania.
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY, New York.
HENRY I. EMERSON, Ohio.
HENRY Z. OSBORNE, California.
RICHARD P. FREEMAN, Connecticut.

FEBRUARY 1, 1918

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1918

IMPROVEMENT OF MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Friday, February 1, 1918.

The committee this day met, Hon. John H. Small (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the committee will kindly come to order. This is the morning that we have assigned to a delegation from Mobile, Ala., and we are ready now, Mr. Gray, and I will ask you to kindly take charge and indicate the gentlemen who desire to be heard.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as stated by our chairman, we have before us to-day certain gentlemen from Mobile, representing the commercial bodies of that port, who are to talk to us about the necessity of an increased appropriation for this great harbor upon the Gulf. They have come here under considerable disadvantages; you know something about the weather conditions. In fact, they have come through ice and snow to get here and were about 12 hours belated. They are extremely anxious about this matter, and desire to speak candidly of the real conditions as they are, and of the wonderful developments that have taken place at Mobile since the last engineer's report. These gentlemen are here especially to inform you, and to show you the reasons why Mobile, at this time, should have a greater appropriation than that contemplated and recommended by the Board of Engineers.

I have pleasure in presenting to you the gentlemen who will act as chairman of the Mobile delegation at this meeting to-day. Mr. Stewart Brooks, of Mobile, vice chairman of the joint rivers and harbor committee, who will address you and will present the other members of the delegation who desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear from you, Mr. Brooks.

STATEMENT OF MR. STEWART BROOKS, VICE CHAIRMAN JOINT RIVERS AND HARBOR COMMITTEE, MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we keenly appreciate the opportunity that presents itself to us to-day. We do not wish to take any more of the time of your committee than we have to, and therefore we will not indulge in generalities. The reason I am before you personally is to save time by giving an outline of how we will present our case. We expect, unless you ask questions that will require something else, to ask you to listen to only three technical speakers. We have a delegation of six gentlemen here. One of our

members is, by invitation, with the Fuel Administration to-day and can not be with us, and we are sorry because he is one of the most experienced men we have. We have talkers who will give you nothing but a plain, uncolored, and unbiased presentation from our viewpoint.

I think it will be within the bounds of propriety for me to thank you for giving us the privilege of entertaining two delegations from this committee, one consisting of your honored chairman and Mr. Switzer, Mr. Emerson, and your assistant secretary, as I recall, and the other consisting of Messrs. Frear and Hulbert. We are sorry to miss Mr. Hulbert, but we are glad to meet his successor, Mr. Lea.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lea succeeds Mr. Kettner; Mr. Hulbert's successor has not been appointed.

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, we shall ask you to hear our case in three sections: First, Mr. Horace Turner, who is an experienced shipping man and will present the case generally. He will handle nearly all of the matters we desire to handle before you to-day. We will then ask you to hear Dr. A. G. Ward, president of the Alabama State Harbor Commission. Then we will hear from Mr. Parsons on the industrial development of Mobile.

I may say that we feel we would be done an injustice if our case were considered on anything written or printed. Developments have been so stupendous and so fast that an accurate idea of the conditions could not be obtained from anything printed or written. Only a few months ago the Government was taking away from Mobile its normal traffic for export, but now the Government has reversed what it formerly did, and more traffic is being thrust upon us than we ever had before. We believe you will find, when you hear from these gentlemen, that our request for increased appropriations for this port is justified.

I now take pleasure in presenting to you Mr. Horace Turner, chairman of our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the hearing concludes, I think it would be proper if you would have one of the gentlemen describe the water terminals as they exist to-day, and your plans for any future development of such terminals.

Mr. BROOKS. I will ask Mr. Turner to present that matter in the opening portion of his talk. I could tell you in a general way, but I think Mr. Turner could present it more concisely, and I will ask Mr. Turner to give that subject his first attention.

STATEMENT OF MR. HORACE TURNER, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT RIVERS AND HARBOR COMMITTEE OF MOBILE.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, our petition here to-day for an increased appropriation is really predicated upon the assumption that we can not ever get 30 feet of water at the rate we are going now. We are already far behind; we should have had 30 feet long ago, but on account of first one thing then another we have been allowed to lag behind our competitors. It was in 1913 that we had a favorable report on Mobile as we thought. We came up before this committee and asked for money, and we were asked to get a further test as to the cost of maintenance. That delayed us until 1916. We then obtained a favorable report. At that time it

was recommended that we should have this 30-foot channel and that it should be completed within a period of four years. We lost much time waiting to get the report, and after the report was approved we lost another two years; so instead of getting a 30-foot channel by 1920, as we expected, we are still not even on the road to getting one, for the appropriations we are getting now will not dig the channel.

I think the appropriation of $100,000 for new work is based upon the idea that we can use one or more of the existing dredges in our district. There are three down there, one at Mobile, one at Pascagoula, and one at Gulfport, and the idea seems to be that those dredges can be used on our work. As a matter of fact, we have been taking up the question with our district engineer of getting our channel dug to where it originally was, viz, 27 feet. The dredges have been called into service for this emergency work, to go around and dig some of the basins in front of shipbuilding plants, etc. They have been called in because there were no private contractors to do that work, so the Government has been doing it, and it has been very necessary, but it took the dredges from the maintenance work, and almost every channel in the Gulf has shoaled up on that account. It is for this reason that at Mobile we can not do anything but keep up the maintenance work. The engineer at Mobile has written me a letter showing that he could not use the Gulfport and Pascagoula dredges to help out. I should like to read that letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Mobile, Ala., January 21, 1918.

Mr. HORACE TURNER,
Mobile, Ala.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry of the 18th instant regarding time when you could count on having the 27-foot depth restored in the Mobile channel and regarding time when any progress could be expected on the new 30-foot channel, will state that on account of the fact that all the dredges of this district have been used for several months in connection with emergency dredging for various shipbuilding plants, all of the three main ship channels of this district are badly shoaled up, and it will not be practicable to divert either of the other dredges to Mobile. Additional delay has been caused by the extensive repairs caused by this private dredging, as the material encountered in dredging for the shipyards caused much more wear and strain on the dredging machinery than that found in the regular channel dredging.

On account of the large amount of shoaling which has already taken place and the delay referred to, it is believed that all of the funds now on hand will be required to restore the 27-foot depth in the channel. As to date when material progress can be made on the 30-foot project this will, of course, depend on the new appropriation, but, as you are probably aware, it will be impossible to make any material progress on the new project with the dredging plant now on hand. The three dredges which we have are from four to nine years old, and the amount of time required to keep them in first-class shape from now on will probably be greater than it has been in the past. As there is a large amount of dredging work in sight at both Gulfport and Pascagoula, it is not believed that dredges can be diverted from either of those channels for any long periods without serious protests from those localities.

Yours, very truly,

G. K. LITTLE,
Special Disbursing Agent.

So you see we can not get anywhere with the dredging plan. We have either got to have another dredge down there—and that would require quite a heavy appropriation—or we have got to have enough money to finish this channel by outside contracts.

The first recommendation of the Chief Engineer was for $850,000. That provided for another dredge, and I think the next recommendation of the local engineer provided for a similar amount, something around $800,000, so that they could really make some headway on this 30-foot project. There is no use talking about giving it to us 10 years or 20 years from now. It is going to be my effort to show you that, based upon our actual tonnage and actual freight conditions, we should have had it long ago, and we should now be given enough money to get it just as quickly as it is possible to do so.

In the first place, I will file with the committee a statement which shows the position of Mobile. This statement is for the year ending June 30, 1913, which is the last normal year for which we have statistics, and which is the last year in which statistics were compiled by the Government in such a manner that you can compare the ports. The statistics are now made up by districts and you can not compare the individual ports any longer.

Statement showing exports and imports for year 1913.

	Exports.	Imports.	Total.
New York	$917,935,988	$1,048,320,629	$1,966,256,617
Galveston	281,457,858	7,820,638	289,278,496
New Orleans	169,980,277	82,399,100	252,379,377
Boston	69,552,657	146,599,451	216,152,108
Philadelphia	76,315,344	93,209,678	169,525,022
Baltimore	116,474,439	32,895,238	149,369,677
San Francisco	66,021,385	62,501,681	128,523,066
Puget Sound	62,548,100	51,473,683	114,021,792
Savannah	58,235,404	4,461,852	62,697,256
Mobile	27,823,998	3,675,180	31,499,178

The second statement gives the net registered tonnage of vessels entered and cleared in foreign trade for the year ending June 30, 1913:

	Vessels.	Tonnage.		Vessels.	Tonnage.
New York	8,089	28,834,780	Galveston	1,376	3,325,460
Puget Sound	8,750	5,945,826	San Francisco	863	2,278,532
New Orleans	2,564	5,312,016	Norfolk	628	1,492,403
Philadelphia	2,173	5,158,600	Sabine	678	1,422,587
Boston	2,623	4,969,419	Mobile	1,386	1,328,689
Baltimore	1,488	3,493,832			

The third statement shows the class of steamers loaded at New Orleans during 1913, showing draft loaded outward:

Steamer.	Draft.	Steamer.	Draft.
Joan D'Arc	28	Saxonia	27.7
Prometheus	27.9	Californian	27.3
Custodian	28	Excelsior	27.8
Victorian	30.6	Phœbus	30
Indian	30.6	Nessian	27.6
Monarch	29	Maartensdijk	29
Cestrian	29	Rathlin Head	28.8
Commanchee	27.9	Armenian	30.6
Bulyssis	27.8	Meltonian	27.8
Wayfarer	28.3	Gorredijk	29.2
Nubian	29.9	Colonian	28.3
Andijk	28.11	Atlantian	29.8
Oxonian	28.4	Kansan	29.5
Hesperus	28	Richmond	30.3

The next is a statement showing the tonnage handled at Mobile and at Savannah, Charleston, Brunswick, Pensacola, and New Orleans, the principal competitors of Mobile; also, at Port Bolivar, Texas City, Key West, and Galveston, all of them having 30 feet of water. This tonnage statement is shown for 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916, and these statistics clearly show that Mobile already has more tonnage than Brunswick and Charleston combined, more than twice the tonnage of Pensacola, and more that that of Port Bolivar, Texas City, Key West, and Brunswick combined, and yet Mobile has to struggle along with a 27-foot channel and handle its tonnage at a disadvantage, although each and every one of these other ports have been given 30 feet of water some time ago. It seems to us that if it is economical for the Federal Government to give these ports 30 feet Mobile should certainly have 30 feet, because her tonnage is equal to that of several of them combined.

Tonnage handled at Mobile and competing ports for 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916, and the depth of channels at such ports.

Year.	Mobile.	New Orleans.	Savannah.	Pensacola.	Port Bolivar.
1912	2,210,486	5,059,830	3,120,676	1,271,979	428,495
1913	2,212,805	6,442,932	3,154,089	1,475,050	256,105
1914	2,392,442	6,273,012	2,478,535	1,164,502	267,640
1915	1,579,804	6,536,132	2,890,130	871,166	182,450
1916	1,673,020	7,300,432	2,748,898	810,544	173,906

Year.	Texas City.	Key West.	Brunswick.	Charleston.	Galveston.
1912	464,237	554,107	725,597	986,206	3,224,367
1913	446,228	458,780	1,009,026	1,043,056	4,455,088
1914	301,106	655,407	487,224	919,184	5,019,794
1915	309,789	1,069,077	500,911	920,802	5,336,889
1916	265,133	1,028,374	470,016	1,105,901	2,513,081

Depth of water:
New Orleans, 31 feet (upon 35-foot project).
Savannah, 26 feet, plus 6-foot tide.
Pensacola, 30 feet.
Port Bolivar, 30 feet.
Texas City, 30 feet.
Key West, 30 feet.
Brunswick, 30 feet, plus 6.6-foot tide.
Galveston, 30 feet.
Mobile, 27 feet.
Charleston, 30 feet, plus 5.2-foot tide.

Mr. BOOHER. How many feet of water have you now?

Mr. TURNER. Twenty-seven feet, and we can not increase the depth at all at the present rate of the appropriations.

Mr. BOOHER. Let me call your attention to the Engineer's Report, page 834, volume 1, "Conditions at the end of fiscal year." The channel across Mobile Bar is now being used? Is that out in the open Gulf?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Is not that the project you are talking about?

Mr. TURNER. It is part of it.

Mr. BOOHER. The engineer says:

The channel across Mobile Bar, formed by dredging, is 300 feet wide and about three-fourths of a mile long and connects the 30-foot curves of depth on each side of the bar. The 30-foot project was completed by dredging during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. Expenditures since its completion have been applied to its maintenance. An increase in depth of 7 feet over that originally existing has resulted. On June 30, 1917, the controlling depth in the dredged channel across this bar was 30 feet at mean low water. The total expenditures under the 30-foot project to June 30, 1917, are as follows: For new work, $100,000; for maintenance, $168,750.40.

Mr. TURNER. That is for three-quarters of a mile of channel out in the Gulf of Mexico, possibly 7 miles from the extrance of the bay. It is out here [indicating on map]. Here is the channel. There is an enormous basin there, but that is down the bay. Then, the channel runs for 30 miles up to Mobile and 3½ miles above Mobile. This channel is across the bar at the lower end and out in the Gulf.

Mr. BOOHER. Where is the channel that you are speaking about?

Mr. TURNER. I am speaking about dredging the channel to get the boats to the harbor where they can load.

Mr. BOOHER. Is any part of the channel up to Mobile 30 feet deep?

Mr. TURNER. No. That is a 27-foot channel, and since the Government dredges have been used for other purposes the channel has now been allowed to shoal in places to 24 feet.

Mr. BOOHER. I did not understand from this just where it was.

Mr. TURNER. It is outside the outer bar channel.

Mr. SWITZER. How far is that from Mobile?

Mr. TURNER. Thirty-seven miles.

Mr. OSBORNE. What is the tide action?

Mr. TURNER. Our tide is one foot and four-tenths inches; but that tide is peculiar. It is not an absolute tide, as you know it on the Atlantic coast. It is affected by the north wind. If the north wind is blowing it would blow the water out of the bay, and the difference between the high water expectancy when a boat goes to sea and the water left in the harbor after the water has been blown out is about 3 to 4 feet. So, instead of having 1.4 feet that we can count on, we often have 3 to 4 feet below normal. So we do not claim a tide. It is one foot and four-tenths if the Lord is with us.

To show you just exactly the predicament we are in as to this depth of water, I want to read a letter I have from a representative of the British Admiralty at Mobile, who represents the Leyland Line, the Harrison, the Manchester, and other lines. This is the agency that represents the British Admiralty and handles the munitions that come to the port of Mobile for the British nation. He is a most violent kicker about the shoaling in the channel because of the fact that he can not get in and out with his ships. This letter will give you an accurate idea of the situation. He complains regularly, and this happens to be the January complaint:

MOBILE LINES (INC.),
Mobile, Ala., January 29, 1918.

MR. HORACE TURNER, *Chairman*
Joint Rivers and Harbors Committee, Mobile, Ala.

DEAR SIR: Referring to telephone conversation:

The following extracts from the below-mentioned owners, whose vessels ply regularly to Mobile, will doubtless be of interest to the Rivers and Harbors Committee of Congress, as showing that 30 feet of water is a pressing need at Mobile.

Extract from letter of Messrs. Thomas and James Harrison (Harrison Line), Liverpool, dated January 7:

"*Clan Sutherland* has been directed into the North Atlantic trade. The ministry of shipping want her to go to Mobile, but she looks rather on the large side, and we will try to get a more suitable vessel sent there instead."

So far, they have not advised us of any vessel they were able to get to substitute for the *Clan Sutherland.*

Extract of letter from Messrs. Frederick Leyland & Co. (Ltd.), (Leyland Line), dated Liverpool, January 4:

"We thank you for the information given us in respect to the maximum draft at Mobile at present, 26 feet. We also learn in this connection from New Orleans that Mr. Guthrie will not agree to a steamer going to Mobile unless she loads to her deep draft, which we shall have to bear in mind when we are able to allocate a steamer to you."

This information that we gave them was an apology for their steamer *Nessian* having to go from Mobile to New Orleans to load 1,026 tons of cargo and bunker coal.

Nessian's loaded draft is 28 feet 10½ inches salt water (29 feet 4½ inches Mobile). *Nessian* is one of 14 similar vessels owned and operated from the Gulf by the Leyland Line, and what applies to her applies to the other 13. As a matter of fact the present draft here leaves out of the Leyland Line's fleet of 44 vessels, only 9 vessels that can load a full cargo at Mobile on the present draft of water. You can readily realize how this hampers them in trying to find vessels they can send to Mobile, and accordingly hampers Mobile.

Yours, truly,

S. A. LE BLANC, *Manager.*

Net tonnage and draft of vessels leaving Mobile.

SEASON JUNE 30, 1913, TO JUNE 30, 1914.

Name.	Net tonnage.	Dead-weight draft.	Draft leaving Mobile.	Where bunkered.
		Ft. in.	*Ft. in.*	
Montauk Point	3,026	26 0	23 0	
Nicosian	4,097	28 10	22 1	
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	20 6	
Antillian	3,678	26 6	21 2	Mobile.
Ninian	4,068	28 10	22 1	
Kyleakin	1,976	21 0	20 5	
Nitonian	4,066	28 10	23 0	
Warrior	2,265	25 0	20 10	Do.
Montauk Point	3,026	26 0	22 4	Do.
Meltonian	4,066	26 6	22 8	Do.
Berwindmoor	2,702	25 6	21 1	
Albanian	1,876	21 9	19 5	Do.
Kirnwood	1,953	22 0	17 8	
Alexandrian	2,899	26 6	23 4	
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	18 6	
Ethyl	1,952	[1] 22 0	16 0	
Springburn	4,120	24 6	19 3	
Ninian	4,068	28 10	23 5	Do.
Arlington Court	2,833	[1] 21 0	19 10	
Tunstall	2,438	22 0	11 3	
Nubian	4,067	28 10	22 5	Do.
Bechuana	2,659	25 6	22 6	
Kyleakin	1,976	21 0	19 3	
Kazembe	2,935	25 3	22 5	
Scythian	3,028	25 0	22 0	Do.
Montauk Point	3,026	26 0	22 0	
Fridland	2,737	24 6	19 3	
Nessian	4,012	28 10	25 3	Do.
Isle of Mull	2,772	25 0	17 0	
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	18 5	
Asian	3,680	26 6	24 8	Do.
Napierian	4,101	28 10	20 6	Do.
City of Naples	3,714	26 3	25 3	
Dalton	2,263	23 6	25 9	
Orubian	2,412	25 6	24 2	Do.
Ar turus	1,525	20 2	20 2	
Kylestrome	2,105	22 0	20 11	
Novian	4,096	28 10	25 4	
Birmingham	2,612	24 3	24 3	

[1] Estimated.

Net tonnage and draft of vessels leaving Mobile—Continued.

SEASON JUNE 30, 1913, TO JUNE 30, 1914—Continued.

Name.	Net tonnage.	Dead-weight draft.	Draft leaving Mobile.	Where bunkered.
		Ft. in.	*Ft. in.*	
Scythian	3,028	25 0	20 5	Mobile.
Nessian	4,012	28 10	25 10	Do.
Albanian	1,876	21 9	22 5	Do.
Nitonian	4,066	28 10	20 2	Do.
Andromeda	1,546	22 0	18 7	
Nestorian	4,075	28 10	23 5	Do.
Nubian	4,067	28 10	25 11	
Strathnairn	2,812	23 0	20 8	
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	18 11	
Ninian	4,068	28 10	25 7	
Nicosian	4,097	28 10	23 1	Do.
Napierian	4,101	28 10	24 11	Do.
Norwegian	4,056	28 10	26 7	
Montauk Point	3,026	26 0	24 5	
Average	3,045	25 3	21 8	

SEASON JUNE 30, 1914, TO JUNE 30, 1915.

		Ft. in.	*Ft. in.*	
Kylestrome	2,105	22 0	18 10	
Nestorian	4,075	28 10	26 6	
Albanian	1,876	21 9	22 1	Mobile.
Orubian	2,412	25 6	21 0	
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	[1]13 6	
Kylestrome	2,105	22 0	19 4	
Kylakin	1,976	21 0	20 2	
Alexandrian	2,899	26 6	23 0	Do.
Meltonian	4,066	26 6	22 0	Do.
Belgian	2,364	22 10	20 1	Do.
Kylemoss	2,206	23 0	23 6	
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	19 11	
St. Quentin	3,191	26 6	22 3	
Nestorian	4,075	28 10	23 5	Do.
Albanian	1,876	21 9	22 0	Do.
Kylakin	1,976	21 0	21 2	
Alexandrian	2,899	26 6	26 4	Do.
Norwegian	4,056	28 10	25 1	Do.
Plutarch	3,587	27 0	23 8	
Nubian	4,067	28 10	27 4	Do.
Kylakin	1,976	21 0	20 11	
Amsteldyk	4,231	28 6	27 5	
Average	2,813	24 7	22 3	

[1] Part cargo only.

SEASON JUNE 30, 1915, TO JUNE 30, 1916.

		Ft. in.	*Ft. in.*	
Nubian	4,067	28 10	27 11	Mobile, July.
Orubian	2,412	25 6	26 0	Mobile, August.
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	20 0	Do.
Napierian	4,101	28 10	26 3	Mobile, September.
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	20 11	Mobile, October.
Sylvanian	3,009	24 9	25 5	Mobile, November.
Alexandrian	2,899	26 6	24 9	Mobile, January.
Kylemhor	1,932	21 0	20 3	Do.
Sylvanian	3,009	24 9	23 1	Mobile, February.
Nicosian	4,097	28 10	26 6	Mobile, March.
Oranian	2,447	24 10	25 4	Mobile, May.
Nubian	4,067	28 10	26 10	Do.
Meltonian	4,066	26 6	27 0	Mobile, June.
Sylvanian	3,009	24 9	24 0	Do.
Average	3,070	25 5	24 7	
Excluding Kylemhor	3,380	26 7	25 9	

It seems that N type of ships of the Leyland Line can not get to Mobile and load their dead-weight capacity, and that applies also to all the largest-sized steamers. They can not take coal, and that ought

to be one of the things to be remedied, because this coal situation at the Atlantic ports is very serious. We should have 30 feet of water just as quickly as we can get it. I am going to read you exactly the reasons I base that on:

(1) Because the largest Gulf steamers, those most economically operated, and which furnish the cheapest ocean transportation, can not come to Mobile until 30 feet of depth is provided, such, for example, as the larger steamers of the Leyland Line, those of the N type, which draw 28.10 loaded in salt water and 29.4 loaded in the fresh water at Mobile.

(2) Because ports of the size of Mobile, which ranks tenth in the total value of exports and imports in the United States, and eleventh in net registered tonnage of vessels entered and cleared in foreign trade—which foreign trade requires the largest steamers—should certainly be as well equipped as to channel depth as those ports upon Gulf and South Atlantic which handle a less volume of tonnage, such, for example, as Texas City, Port Bolivar, Pensacola, Key West, Fernandina, Brunswick, Charleston, etc.

(3) Because Mobile can not fairly compete with New Orleans and Galveston on one side and Pensacola, Savannah, Brunswick, etc. (all having 30 feet or more) upon the other side until Mobile has 30 feet at least.

(4) Because Mobile has an uncertain tide, a tide greatly affected by the north winds of winter, which shallow the water from 3 to 4 feet, this being the difference between the high-water expectancy at which ships deeply laden leave port and the water actually left by the northers of several days' duration. Also, because of fresh water at Mobile, there is a loss of 6 inches in draft as compared with ports having salt water. A steamer drawing 27 feet loaded at Mobile, in fresh water, will draw 26 feet 6 inches at Pensacola, in salt water, with the exact same cargo.

(5) Because the completion of the locks and dams of Alabama's river system will influence the movement to Mobile of vast amounts of coal, iron, steel, cotton, hardwoods, staves, etc., from that territory, richer in natural resources than any section of the South, one city alone, Birmingham, producing more tons of freight yearly than the entire State of Georgia.

(6) Because Mobile—the only port in Alabama and the logical port for concentration of the large tonnage of Alabama, including 1,125,000,000 tons of iron ore and 57,600,000,000 tons of coal in its area of 52,250 square miles, and also the nearest port for the tonnage produced in one-half of Mississippi with its area of 46,810 square miles, a combined territory greater than that of all the New England States combined—should receive the lowest ocean rates obtainable from the largest steamers operated in the Gulf and requiring channel depth of 30 feet or more.

(7) Because the millions of dollars spent by the Federal Government in creating year-round navigation to the coal and iron fields of Alabama, and in opening up 1,500 miles of navigable streams, would be largely nullified if there was a lack of deep water at Mobile, the natural port for breaking bulk.

(8) Because less than 30 feet at Mobile means the necessity of forwarding large quantities of coal, iron, steel, etc., at an expense of at least 30 cents per ton to ports beyond Mobile where the larger steamers of the Gulf must go to load. To avoid the necessity of forwarding annually beyond Mobile just 150,000 tons of coal and iron would pay the interest upon the additional $1,000,000 necessary to provide 30 feet at Mobile.

(9) Because steamers of the larger class, between 8,000 and 12,000 tons, after loading at New Orleans and Galveston, and which mainly coal at Pensasola and Norfolk, can not possibly come to Mobile for bunker coal until 30 feet or more of depth is provided.

(10) Because Mobile, being the nearest port to the iron and steel supply of Alabama, requires a deeper channel for this very dead-weight cargo than ports upon the Gulf and South Atlantic with their lighter cargoes of cotton and lumber.

(11) Because Mobile, left with a 27-foot channel, must continue to select steamers to be operated in trade to Europe, South America, Cuba, and Pacific coast, to guard against steamers being loaded too near the bottom, there being numerous complaints from owners of ships that Mobile is not a safe port for some of the steamers already loaded at Mobile.

(12) Because Mobile, with more ship repairing facilities, both steel and wood, than all the Gulf ports combined, possessing more skilled machinists

than any port upon the Gulf, and having the cheapest coal of any American port, should be made available as a repairing and coaling port for the United States Navy. And these facilities should be made available at the earliest possible moment. Twenty-seven feet of depth, with requirements of the Navy of several feet under keels, would prevent the accommodation of any of the larger warships at Mobile. It would seem that the $40,000 per year spent by the Federal Government in interest charges to create a 30-foot channel would be well spent if for no other purpose than to open the repairing facilities and coal at Mobile to the United States fleet.

In the last analysis, the question to be determined is: Shall the Federal Government incur an annual interest charge of $40,000:

To provide 30 feet at a port ranking tenth in size in exports and imports and eleventh in net registred tonnage of vessels entered and cleared in foreign trade.

To place Mobile upon a parity with smaller ports which handle only one-quarter to one-half the tonnage of Mobile.

To enable more than 2,000,000 tons of freight valued at more than $60,000,000 to obtain the lowest ocean rates possible by making Mobile a safe port for the largest steamers operating in the Gulf.

To guarantee that, through the millions of dollars spent by the Federal Government in locks and dams, the coal, iron, and other resources of Alabama shall enjoy the largest market and widest distribution upon reaching tidewater at Mobile.

To make available to the United States Navy both the cheapest coal in America and the largest ship-repairing plants upon the Gulf.

To permit the saving of 30 cents per ton upon all the coal and iron, steel, and steel products necessarily shipped by rail and by barge beyond Mobile to be loaded aboard the larger steamers at New Orleans and other ports and to relieve the railroad congestion to that extent.

As the Government has spent some $13,000,000 in the improvement of the river system of Alabama, and something over $7,000,000 in the harbor at Mobile, it should certainly expend the extra 5 per cent to get the greatest use out of that expenditure, and spend that money right away.

Mr. SWITZER. How does the traffic on this improved Warrior River compare with last year and the year before?

Mr. TURNER. The last lock was only completed recently. We have not really been able to make a comparison for any period of time, because they were only operating through some of the lower locks until the Government finally completed Lock No. 17, handling about 25,000 tons each month.

Mr. SWITZER. The traffic was about 25,000 tons a month?

Mr. TURNER. About 25,000 tons a month.

Mr. SWITZER. Mostly barge traffic?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir. Now, there is serious consideration being given by the Shipping Board and the Fuel Administration and other boards——

Mr. SWITZER. The Government could direct this traffic to go by water?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; but it is a question of getting equipment. Barging is no poor man's business. It requires quite an expenditure to do it properly. The overhead expense is so much that you can not afford to spread it over a few towboats and barges. You have got to have an extensive equipment, and you have got to handle it in a large way. I say, the Government is looking over that situation and has men down there studying this very problem.

There is coal all over Alabama; some along the river banks possibly only a half mile back from the water's edge. That is not as good as some coal farther back. Really, if proper facilities were pro-

vided to bring it down, millions of tons could be brought over the Frisco road and others and taken to Mobile, but up to the present time barges have not been built upon any extensive scale.

This last lock has only been completed recently. They have not had an opportunity to do much. Six self-propelled barges were constructed to carry coal to New Orleans.

Mr. SWITZER. What is the cost of constructing a barge? What amount of tonnage do they carry?

Mr. TURNER. They carry about a thousand tons; they are a couple of hundred feed long.

Mr. SWITZER. They probably cost twice as much now as they did heretofore?

Mr. TURNER. I suppose so. There are two types of barges—one a self-propelled barge and the other a cheap coal barge of open wood construction which they tie to towboats and push down. But that all requires considerable money, and as yet barging has not been fully developed. Some of the coal people have had trouble with the railroads, and of course there is not any great love between the railroads and the river people.

Mr. SWITZER. And that is not lessening.

Mr. TURNER. But everybody has more business now than they can possibly handle.

To speak of this situation from just one other angle, as a war measure. I suppose nearly everybody who comes up here has a project which he thinks is absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of this war, and thinks we could not win the war unless his particular project went through.

But I have looked at it not only from the point of view of Mobile as a port, but from still another view. The port of New York handles as much tonnage as all the ports from Charleston to the Mexican border combined. We all know that port efficiency is limited by the railroad efficiency. The ports can do no more than their railroads can do. I spent some three months up along the Atlantic seaboard late in the fall, and I found New York, Baltimore, and other places I visited so congested that you could not get a warehouse. The railroads can not unload the cars. They have got to send that tonnage somewhere; they have got to send it to Charleston and other southern ports. You are building up a vast fleet of boats; you are building these steamers everywhere. You have got to load them, and, furthermore, the Government has got to take from the contractors the things they make—these war munitions. If you do not take these war munitions the manufacturers can not continue to make them. And if you do not continue to use cars as they are available your railroad equipment will have no efficiency.

Mr. BOOHER. What is the draft of the boats they are manufacturing now in the United States?

Mr. TURNER. In the United States—I could not absolutely tell you, but I think most of the larger boats would draw about 28 feet, others 30 feet. A freight boat that will take 8,000 tons or thereabouts is really the most desirable size.

Mr. BOOHER. Could the 8,000-ton ships get into Mobile?

Mr. TURNER. Not with a dead-weight cargo.

Mr. BOOHER. How much water do they draw?

Mr. TURNER. About 28 feet. I have a statement from the pilots in New Orleans, which will give you an idea——

Mr. BOOHER. Just let me ask you one more question. Are they not manufacturing a great many of those boats that draw less than 28 feet?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Why could not they use those boats?

Mr. TURNER. They can use them, and no doubt they will if they have to. The United States Steel Corporation is building a plant at Mobile, which is going to be one of the great shipbuilding plants, and they are going to build the large type of boats. If you have goods to deliver, it is economical to use a big wagon instead of a small one.

Mr. BOOHER. If you have not got a wagon suited for that use, you can use a smaller one.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understand from Mr. Turner that they have not any control of this, and that they want to make a harbor big enough to accommodate the boats.

Mr. TURNER. They do not really build a wagon to suit the goods, but they build a wagon which they can use most economically.

Mr. BOOHER. After they build those 8,000-ton ships how are you going to get them out?

Mr. TURNER. There is going to be an economic waste, because they will have to send them to other ports to load to their dead-weight capacity. I want to emphasize one thing: They have been accumulating a lot of goods in warehouses at Mobile. I know of a particular terminal where there are some six cargoes of portable houses for the United States troops in France. They have a couple of steamer loads of sewer pipe there which are going for use over in France. If they want to send them by those larger boats of the Leyland Line, they can not do so, because they can not load and get out. They would have to say, "We will have to wait until some boats come along that we can send to Mobile to take those goods," and that is not an economical situation for the Government. When you eliminate all the ports from Norfolk to New York, which are pretty well up to their maximum now, then the ports from Charleston to the Mexican border will not only have to handle the normal tonnage but the overflow. You are building a great fleet of boats to move a vast amount of stuff for the Army, and I think it will require about a boat clearing every hour to take care of that.

Imagine the situation you have. It will not be wise to move from that territory east of the Mississippi River and bounded by the Great Lakes, the Atlantic, and the Gulf of Mexico the munitions and the food supplies across the Mississippi, down to Galveston and the Texas ports, because that would be a railroad waste and we can not afford to waste transportation. Besides, those ports absolutely need their facilities to handle what is going to be raised in that territory west of the Mississippi, the Texas crop, the cotton and the stuff in the territory west to the Pacific coast.

You have the ports from Norfolk to New York congested, and their efficiency in any event is measured by the efficiency of the railroads serving them. And the railroads are taxed to their capacity to handle the coal, the manufactured goods, and provisions absolutely essential to the life of this section.

You must then use the ports from Charleston to the Mexican border to relieve the congestion and to provide the necessary terminal facilities to accommodate the vast ship tonnage being constructed by the United States and Great Britain.

If the ports from Charleston to New Orleans can be speeded up to handle 50 per cent more tonnage than they ever handled before, you could then not handle through these ports more than an additional 10,000,000 tons of goods. If the ports from New Orleans to the Mexican border can likewise be speeded up to handle 50 per cent more than they ever handled before in their history, you can handle through such ports about 5,000,000 tons of additional goods.

When you consider that the United States is expecting to complete at least 3,000,000 net registered tons of shipping in 1918, capable of moving at least 6,000,000 tons dead-weight at one time, and that these ships will average about nine trips yearly, you can see that you will have a yearly tonnage to care for of over 50,000,000 tons. And remember that the British Government is building even more ships than the United States. Say they are capable of lifting 50,000,000 tons also yearly. Then you have something like 100,000,000 tons of goods to be moved through ports from Charleston to the Mexican border, which, when speeded up to 50 per cent more tonnage than they ever handled before, can only accommodate a total additional tonnage over and above what is now being sent through these ports of some 15,000,000 tons. From this you will see that the Government will need every port improved to the limit, will need every additional wharf and warehouse and railroad track that can be constructed during the year 1918. The funnel—the ports upon Atlantic and Gulf—can not take care of the prospective flow of tonnage which must be provided for at the ports if the ships under construction during 1918 are to be loaded and dispatched abroad.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How much do you think should be appropriated in this bill to meet the situation in Mobile; how much should be expended during the coming year?

Mr. TURNER. I think the entire appropriation should be expended. Three years ago the engineer recommended $850,000. That was within a couple of hundred thousand dollars of the total appropriation. They recommended that for the reason that they had to have another dredge or they could not make any headway on this 30-foot project. It is going to cost a good deal of money to build a dredge. But also if you are looking at the first cost only, it costs considerable money to hire somebody else to do the dredging. If you build a dredge, of course, you come into the shipbuilding market, and I do not know whether it is a wise move to try to come in and take some of the labor already needed in order to build a dredge. But at least you could buy existing dredges if the appropriation is made so elastic as to enable you to go and buy them. In the Mobile district they have got to have another dredge to relieve those other plants, and if the Government buys a dredge they will really have a dredge left for use after finishing the 30-foot project. To get this 30-foot channel quickly we have got to have enough money to buy or hire some dredges.

Mr. GRAY. It has been suggested that contracts may be made with private firms.

Mr. TURNER. If you give us $100,000, it will not dig anything. If you give us the full amount, it will enable us to do something that will relieve this Government transportation congestion.

Mr. OSBORNE. Assuming that this appropriation was immediately available, how long would it take to complete that project and get the channel you desire, by contract or in any other way?

Mr. TURNER. If they would appropriate all the money and the engineer would do as any business man would who was in a hurry—we have a very good engineer there now, and I think he would do it—my belief is we could dredge it in less than a year. You might not have the full width of 300 feet, but you could dig a channel 200 feet wide to a depth of 30 feet and handle the ships, and then take your time to finish it. The ships could use a channel of 200 feet, but they would have to go a little slower. A narrow channel is not as economical to maintain as a wide one, because the propellers suck in mud from the sides. We will have to have a 300-foot channel eventually. But we could get through with a 200-foot channel without much trouble, and it would enable us to get these boats in and out and that would relieve this transportation congestion.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like to ask a general transportation question. As I understand you, the congestion at ports which are handling their maximum tonnage results from two things: Because the railroads from the factories to those ports are carrying all the tonnage they can, and because of congestion at terminals also, they have no place to unload the cars while waiting for transfer to the boats. If the Warrior River and the Erie Canal are open for transportation, why is not the quickest way and the surest way to relieve the factories to have the Government put the freight on barges and use those waterways, and at the same time increase terminals in ports like New York and Mobile? Why are those two things not needed?

Mr. TURNER. Those are two of the things needed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I recognize that Mobile Harbor has got to have enough water to be used when the goods get there.

Mr. TURNER. It would not do any good if you could not get the goods on the boats. One of the things I noticed at the Atlantic port terminals is that there is absolutely no teamwork. They put one cargo into a terminal. There may be five other cargoes trying to get to that terminal. The boat on which the first cargo of goods is to be loaded is sunk, and there is no boat sent to take its place, and the cars line the tracks waiting to be unloaded. The terminals are one of the weakest links in the chain.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They should have a director general to supervise the receiving and dispatching of freight from the ocean ports?

Mr. TURNER. Yes. You limit the elasticity of the railroads when you do not take the freight away from them as soon as the trains get there. That has always been the case. We had coming to Mobile in January 60,000 tons; in one particular terminal there were 25,000 tons of supplies of the United States Government, and unless boats are sent there it does not take long to fill up the whole place. You have got to speed up every port you have; you have got to increase your terminals; you have got to do everything you can to strengthen those weak links in the chain.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think the chairman suggested that you say something about the terminals.

Mr. TURNER. In 1907 we handled over 3,000,000 tons of goods. Since 1907 we have increased our terminal facilities 77 per cent. We have 16,000 linear feet of docks.

Mr. DUPRÉ. What terminal do you represent?

Mr. TURNER. I am not here as the owner of a terminal, but I am talking for Mobile. Since we entered the war the Government arbitrarily took boats and sent them to the North Atlantic ports, they concentrated cargoes in those ports and soon congested every one of them, and our Mobile terminals have not been used to within 30 per cent of their efficiency. Then some of the ports like New Orleans were congested, while other ports were not used at all.

Mr. DUPRÉ. You do not mean to imply that they could not handle more than they do now at New Orleans?

Mr. TURNER. They have 20 per cent more tonnage than their normal capacity now, but if they send boats to New Orleans this port could handle more, and so could every Gulf port, but it would not take more than a month to block any port if ships were not sent, because the goods are moving in enormous quantities.

Mr. BOOHER. Is not the congestion of the railroad terminals as bad as the congestion at the seaports?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; but I think the seaports have put a large part of the burden upon the railroads. Where the railroads could not get the facilities for storing at the seaports, they have had to keep the goods in the cars and to line the tracks a hundred miles back.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am told that actually there are great quantities of material in the city of New York that have become obsolete for war purposes.

Mr. BOOHER. My idea was that it was not simply on account of the lack of water, but that the railroads are also so congested that they can not get to the seaports.

Mr. SWITZER. I would like to suggest right there, after the congestion in New York Harbor, which has been congested for months and months, what would you say about a policy of taking freight from Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and northeast Alabama, that could reach these Gulf ports, and sending it to the Gulf? Would that help any?

Mr. BOOHER. That is the question, What would help it?

Mr. TURNER. That would help. It would not help unless you sent boats there. If there was sufficient coordination and they would send the boats to the ports which were not congested, you could move this tonnage. Now, you are building boats, and you are hoping to build them in sufficient number to move all necessary freight. The freight is going to come in a very large volume. We have just started on this war, and we have already put this coast line from New York to Norfolk entirely out of business. You have got to transfer it farther south to relieve that situation. You have got to move it from Charleston on down to these Gulf ports.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Turner, I understand the very thing you have suggested has been done within the past 24 or 48 hours. I understand that Mr. Franklin has been named Director General of Shipping and has been given full charge. He is the head of the International Mercantile Marine, and they say he is the best shipping

expert in the country. I understand he is to be given full charge of all shipping for both the United States and the allies.

Mr. TURNER. They generally take a man out of some one port who knows his own port best and does not know anything about the balance of the country. If they would take one man from New Orleans, one from Savannah, and one from several other places, they could probably accomplish something. A man knows his own port but generally he does not know much about other ports. In New York they do not know that we are on the map, whether in Virginia or Alabama. Most of them do not even leave their offices to go down and take a look at the boats, but they do business all by telephone. They do not know what the balance of the country is doing, as a rule. I hope this congestion is going to be relieved, and there certainly should have been some teamwork in the past. They could have distributed that tonnage logically, sensibly, so as to move it with the least friction; they could have relieved the railroads long ago and the terminals long ago, if there had been somebody directing it and sending it along in a sensible way.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you describe now, or, if not, could you furnish for the record a description of all the water terminals which you have there, and the ones which are owned by the city of Mobile, particularly as to those which are owned by the municipality?

Mr. TURNER. The engineers made a report on this blue print and figured it all out. I could introduce that blue print which would give you what you want.

The CHAIRMAN. We can not print that in the record. We want a brief statement of the terminals which you have there and which are owned by the city, and their stage of completion.

Mr. TURNER. Well, the Mobile & Ohio and the Southern Railway have the largest terminals in Mobile. The Louisville & Nashville has terminals. The city of Mobile has about 1,250 feet improved, and they have also sold bonds to the extent of $600,000, to add quite another link to it. The company I represent has the largest independent terminal there, something like 4,000 linear feet of wharf front, which is in itself more than Texas City and Port Bolivar combined have got. I think that, with the linear feet of wharfage the city is to build would have something like 20,000 linear feet. That is about all the wharves we will need for some time, unless the Government sends us a vast volume of goods, which will require a lot of warehouse space, and in that case the Government will have to help build warehouses to take care of that situation. No individual would dare to spend millions of dollars to build warehouses, not knowing whether they were going to be used or not after the war.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does the shipbuilding company contemplate the construction of any terminals?

Mr. TURNER. No; their plant is absolutely a shipbuilding industry; to build ships. They are going to build ways to hold 10 ships at a time, and they are going to make steel plates at their Birmingham plant, bring them to Mobile, and put them into these ships.

Mr. SWITZER. Is the United States Steel Corporation going to have its own terminal?

Mr. TURNER. They are simply going to build ships at present, I am told. Now, what they are going to do in the future, of course, I do not know. There is a rumor that they are going to bring in

manganese ore from South America and ore of that kind from Cuba, and mix it there with the ores from Alabama to make high-grade steel.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me put this proposition to you. Suppose some company in Birmingham should contract to send a shipload to some point, and should engage a ship to come into Mobile, and should not utilize any of the existing brokerage or other shipping exchanges at Mobile, but should act independently themselves, where could that concern and the ship itself, as a matter of right, dock and load, without regard to any privately owned terminal?

Mr. TURNER. Where could they go?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TURNER. Well, they should be allowed to go to any terminal, for they are all public in the sense that they are used in interstate commerce. We fought out quite an issue on that before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any municipal terminals?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; they could go to the city wharves, where they have a large warehouse. They could also come to ours. The moment the ship came in the harbor the wharf companies would send their solicitors out to get the ship to come to their wharves, in order to get the wharfage charge out of the goods so there would be absolutely no impediment in the way of the ship getting its cargo loaded and getting out again. If the cargo came down the river, as a rule, I think it would be loaded in stream, where the ship would moor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any agency in the city of Mobile authorized to fix rates for the use of terminals?

Mr. TURNER. The State Harbor Commission has more or less jurisdiction. There is no complaint at Mobile over the charges. I do not think the charges at any of the railroad terminals—and they generally set the pace for all the terminals—are any too high. The railroads have always set the rates for the independent terminals, and, as a rule, the rates have always been abnormally low, growing out of the custom of the railroads of bidding for export and import business.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You mean the competition between the different lines of railroads?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; the railroads have made the terminal charges lower than anybody else can afford to build terminals and operate them under.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Because they depend not only on the wharfage, but on the haul?

Mr. TURNER. I have seen some things handled by the railroad that if I had to handle it upon the railroad basis I would give them my facilities free, I would give them my superintendence free, I would give them my warehouse free, and then I would pay 10 cents a ton for the privilege of having handled it. I have particularly in mind fertilizers and nitrates. After giving them everything free, you would have to pay 10 cents a ton for the privilege of having looked at it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Where do you come in?

Mr. TURNER. I can not afford to handle it. I am only showing how the railroads lower the charges on these things and the keen competition there is between them to get the business away from each

other. The competition makes them do these things. I have been on the Pacific coast, and I have been everywhere, and I do not know of but two ports anywhere in the country that really get enough money out of the terminals to pay their operating costs and a fair interest on their investment. And even under the system in New Orleans, State owned, where the land did not cost them anything, and all they had to do was to build the improvements, they do not get any more than the interest on the improvements. And in Galveston, where they have one of the best systems I know, they only make a reasonable interest, about 5 or 6 per cent; that is all. And there they are up to date, and they handle their docks all under one head, and the minimum of facilities does the maximum of work.

The CHAIRMAN. We did not find but one up to date terminal in Galveston.

Mr. TURNER. That is the Galveston Wharf Company, and that owns all of them, except what the Southern Pacific have.

Mr. KENNEDY. My recollection is that the criticism made of your terminal facilities by the engineers was that they were not modern. How about that? He said there were probably plenty of terminals, but they were not modern, as I recall, some of them at least.

Mr. TURNER. You ought not to speak about your own child, but frankly, I have not seen any of them better than what we have, anywhere from New York on down. We have got one built on a concrete foundation, with vitrified brick floors, and just one of these warehouses is 125 by 480 feet. Chairman Small saw fit, and it is a very good terminal. I have seen the terminal structures all over the Atlantic and Pacific, and it seems to me they have not got any that are better than what we have.

The CHAIRMAN. In this movement which the committee is making to try to induce the construction of adequate terminals, we find a disposition on the part of every city to claim that its own terminals are all that are necessary.

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had considerable correspondence, for instance, with cities and towns on the great Ohio River, and I think that correspondence develops that none of them will admit that their terminals are not adequate, and yet a representative engineer says that they are absolutely insufficient. Now, we saw terminals in Mobile that seemed to have ample water frontage, and the foundations were certainly stable and satisfactory, and, as I recall, if any criticism could be made of them, it was these two, that they did not have perhaps modern facilities for transferring freight, and that the connections with the railroads were not such as to give close physical connection between the rail cars and the ships.

Then, again, I submit for your consideration that the time has come when no great port like Mobile can afford to permit its terminal facilities to be monopolized by the railroads and by private ownership. The time has come when there must be at least one, or as many more as may be necessary, adequate terminals, equipped in a modern way, owned by the public, regulated by the public, so that it shall be absolutely open to any ship, whether that ship is loaded through local agencies, or outside agencies. I would not for a moment suggest that you are lagging behind a number of other ports,

but I do submit those two suggestions for the consideration of your progressive city—terminals which shall be constructed in a modern way for transferring freight, and that shall have easy connection with all the railroads serving the port.

Mr. TURNER. And the next one is that we shall have public terminals? Now, let me see if we can qualify in those two regards. Public terminals—we have them; and there are a great many ports that I have mentioned that have not any that you have given 30 feet of water to. We have got the city wharf there at Mobile, and the new one they are planning to build is more extensive than the present one. You will find that a great number of places that I have mentioned, which you have given 30 feet of water to, have no public terminals at all. If you are going to class ports, we ought to be measured, good or bad, by the same board of engineers. We would class good as to public terminals.

Now, when it comes down to the accessibility to the railroads, there is not a terminal at present located within the active water frontage of Mobile that is not reached by every railroad coming into Mobile. If you are located upon the tracks of one railroad, that railroad switches into your plant, and the other railroads get into your plant by paying a $2 switching charge to transfer the car.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me give you this illustration, which, according to my reading and study of the subject, is one of the essentials of a terminal: There must be, of course, water-front and warehouse facilities, and there must be a railroad track alongside of the pier between the ship and the bulkhead and the warehouse—at least one track, better two—so that cars may be loaded there along the pier between the ship and the warehouse.

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That there shall be also movable cranes operated by some power, preferably electricity, so as to take the heaviest products out of the ship and put them on the car and into the warehouse, or from the car or from the warehouse into the ship; and, if I am correct, those being the essentials of a modern terminal, is there a terminal in Mobile which has those facilities?

Mr. TURNER. After traveling over every coast line in America, I do not know of one port—not one—that can measure up to Mobile in that particular regard. Practically every track, practically every warehouse in Mobile has a wharf apron, as we call it, over which tracks are run and over which cars come alongside the ship. That has been our method of building our terminals at Mobile. In some other places, while it might be your idea of the right method, Mr. Chairman, this can not be done. Take New Orleans, considered one of the foremost ports and one of the best equipped of all: They can not run those railroad tracks and those locomotives out on their wharves. They do not dare put that weight on them, and therefore they bring the tracks behind the warehouse, possibly 250 feet from the water front, and everything is unloaded from the car and put on trucks and run to the warehouse, there unloaded, and then taken by stevedores onto the ship. In Mobile, for certain reasons, we can handle everything from the car to the boat, or from the car into the warehouse, and we have got tracks that run alongside of every wharf in Mobile. On my own terminal we have got them on both sides of

the slip, at the city wharf they have the same thing, and the Southern and Mobile & Ohio have the same thing.

But you can not generally unload from cars direct to ships. You must accumulate a cargo ahead of the steamer, concentrate it in the warehouse. You can not load that steamer with dispatch, you can not load a steamer in four days, which is our record, as against a couple of weeks in the northern Atlantic ports, unless you accumulate the cargo beforehand. When the cars roll in ahead of the steamer, you have got to put their contents in the warehouse, and when the ship comes in you have got to truck the goods up to the ship.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In other words, you have got 9,000-ton steamers?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the tonnage of a car is from 30 to 40 tons?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You have got to have 300 cars?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You can not hold over 3 or 4 cars; and certainly not over 7 or 8, in there at once? I mean for the purposes of unloading.

Mr. TURNER. For unloading; yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Loading them into the steamer?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And you would have to have 300 of them, and what you say is that it would be a more economical way to concentrate the freight in the warehouse and then load from the warehouse?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; for two reasons. One is that you can not tie up all those cars, which you would have to do; the second reason is that you could not load the ships as quickly from cars as you could if you had the freight concentrated in the warehouse. It costs you $5,000 a day for every day that the steamer is delayed. They used to be worth $750 or $1,000, but now they are up to $5,000, and every day you delay one of them it is worth that much money to you. You have got to have that freight in the warehouse in order not to delay your ship, and you have got to load it just as fast as you can.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not understand you to be arguing against the necessity of rail tracks upon wharves.

Mr. TURNER. No; they are absolutely essential. You are absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. You are simply speaking now about slips for loading the ships?

Mr. TURNER. We must have these tracks; you are perfectly correct in that. When you get bulky cargo, especially a very heavy cargo, if you can possibly bring it to the ship as soon as she arrives, it is more economical to take that cargo and load it right from the car onto the ship. But there is much of it that you can not load that way. In lumber ports they bring the cars with the heavy timbers alongside of the ship and hoist them on board. They should have these tracks, but in some places it is impossible to have them. For instance, in New Orleans and in Montreal, which has one of the best systems of docks I ever saw, those tracks can not be constructed on some wharves because of physical obstacles. You can not run that weight out on some of them, because they will not stand it. They have to unload cars back on hard ground, back behind the warehouses. The general conditions have got to be considered at each port.

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest that there are two books you might purchase some time, by Edwin J. Clapp, an American student?

Mr. TURNER. I have read them.

The CHAIRMAN. The ports on the Rhine and the port of Hamburg?

Mr. TURNER. I have read them. I know the conditions they have got over there. They build great big concrete piers down into the water, and they can run great weights out on them. As far as I know, there is not a port in America that has a solid concrete dock. We have got to take a back seat on that. We have not the money to build these concrete piers, and it took the Canadian Government to get back of Montreal, in order to build the concrete piers they have got there; the whole nation did that. But here the Federal Government does not build the terminals; they tell the people to build them, and those particular ports that have terminals such as you describe have had them built by the State or national Governments.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the competition of Canada for trade. Canada simply pays for the traffic from the canal to the St. Lawrence, and in order to get it she is willing to do that work. We are not willing to do it. We let them run away with it.

Mr. TURNER. It costs a lot of money to build such docks. The upkeep is a trifle, but it takes the longest pocketbook you ever saw. There is not a terminal in America that would pay one-half of 1 per cent, much less 6 per cent, on the investment on a concrete terminal of that kind at the present terminal charges.

Now, I would like to speak about one more thing, about this question of mechanical devices, which has been talked of a great deal. Now, that is governed so largely by the class of traffic that you have got, that you can not measure each and every port the same. If you had a solid cargo, take, for illustration, a solid cargo of coffee, coming into a port, you can make a belt arrangement that will run that coffee right into the warehouse. But there is only one port in the country that gets coffee, and that is New Orleans. It is the same way with coal, or oil. The people that build their own ships for handling the business they are interested in, build the equipment for receiving it and taking it away quickly. But when you come to a mixed cargo it is quite a different proposition. They have tried their best to devise something that would handle a car of lumber running from 12 to 40 feet long and next a car of flour, and the trouble is that when you are loading a miscellaneous cargo, you do not get enough of one class of material to warrant use of a mechanical rig. Then, the next problem you have got is this. Under the system of chartering steamers, which has been in existence for ages, the charterer has the use of the ship's winches. He simply pays the winchmen so much for their time for operating them. If you had your own mechanical device, you would have to pay those men for handling it just the same. Every steamer which comes has its winches. They have plenty of them and these steam winches are mechanical devices of great efficiency. You can load the boat anywhere with the ship's winches.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to be arguing that Mobile has reached the ideal in terminals, and you have had the last word on the subject, and there is not anything more that you have to learn, or have to do?

Mr. TURNER. No, sir; I do not say that. I am simply arguing the point from the steamship standpoint. I say that is what you have got to consider.

Mr. GRAY. You have spoken very intelligently on the situation at Mobile and the necessity of further improvement at this time, but I want to get back to this point. You know the Army engineers have an idea of proceeding along certain lines. I will read this expression by one of the engineers who recommends "that no work be done until some competent authorized legal agency has made and presented a plan for further transfer and terminal facilities, and it is made certain that a suitable plan will be pressed to completion at a suitable rate of progress."

Now, let us get back to a very interesting and important statement. I understood you to say that Mobile had voted or issued $600,000 in bonds?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. Have not those bonds been sold?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; and the money is in bank.

Mr. GRAY. And the money is on hand?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; the land has been bought and the contract to be let for doing the work. They are asking bids on it now.

Mr. GRAY. Has a competent, authorized legal agency made and presented a plan and arrangement for further transfer and further terminal facilities in Mobile?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. It has been made certain that an extended plan will be pressed to completion at a suitable rate of progress, has it not?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. And that it will be completed at a reasonable rate of progress?

Mr. TURNER. Nobody can tell what the future may be. The cost of the work may finally be prohibitory. We can not tell what is going to be done. It looks to me like only the Government can afford to do anything at this day and time, but everything is being done now looking to that end. They have got the money, and they are going to spend it.

Mr. GRAY. In other words, you have fulfilled those conditions, as expressed by this engineer, have you not?

Mr. TURNER. Yes; but I want to tell you that Mobile earnestly protests against those conditions— for this reason, that if they want to measure a port by what it has got, they should lay the same conditions on all. Why should you stop making improvements in Mobile Harbor, which has more terminals and has got five times as great commerce as some of these other ports? That is my idea. That engineer ought to take every port from New York down. Why should not the same idea apply all the way around the coast. Why should you pick one fellow out and say, "You ought to do something"? They should all be measured by the same standards.

Mr. DUPRÉ. We have got to start on the right road somewhere. I do not mean that for Mobile necessarily; but under your theory you would never get started, because you were wrong in the past.

Mr. TURNER. No; I do not think so. I say if you are going to do this thing why don't you take every one of them? Why go and

penalize New York, say, because they are congested, and say, "You can never have any more water." You are punishing the fellows that have got to ship through there. Why punish Mobile when we have more terminals than some other ports?

Mr. SWITZER. If you are given 30 feet of water, what do you say as to these conditions being absolutely complied with? If you are given 30 feet of water down there, or an increase to that?

Mr. TURNER. We do not want any conditions, and I will tell you why.

Mr. SWITZER. What I want to know is this: Will you people provide port facilities for the increased tonnage that will be brought in?

Mr. TURNER. How could anybody make that statement? To begin with, we do not know what you are going to send down there. In the next 12 months, if you continue building all these boats, I really look for every port in the United States to be in a state of congestion, such as has happened in the North Atlantic ports. How can any human being say, when you are turning out this vast amount of boats and propose getting an army over to France of four or five million men, that the facilities of the ports are going to be adequate? We can not furnish them. I object to any conditions, because you are penalizing us, and I do not think you ought to do it.

We have handled more tonnage than we have got now, with 9,000 linear feet of wharfage, and we have got 16,000 linear feet to-day more than half a dozen of some of those ports put together. With any reasonable movement of boats we could handle our tonnage, could handle more than we have ever gotten before, more than we ever dreamed of in the past.

Mr. DUPRÉ. When this project was adopted in the act of August, 1917, were not these conditions eliminated?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir; we went before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I understand it is not operative at all. It does not exist except in so far as these recommendations were mentioned here, but Congress did not adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Turner, there is just one item I want to call your attention to, and that is the Big Warrior and the Tombigbee systems of rivers. That system has been completed at a cost of about nine and a half million dollars.

Mr. TURNER. Thirteen millions, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that project alone was about $9,000,000.

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is so stated here—$9,721,396.

Mr. TURNER. Was that the Tombigbee alone?

The CHAIRMAN. The Big Warrior and the Tombigbee system and the little streams on that system. That has been under construction for a long number of years, and many of us who have been here some time remember the activities of Senator Bankhead when he was a Member of the House and a member of this committee also. Since then he has entered the Senate. The committee on that system of rivers does not at this time justify the expenditure which has been made for that improvement. The prospects of an increased tonnage, based both upon your statement and other information, indicates

that there will be an increased commerce. I would like to call your attention and that of the other gentlemen here, as representatives of the commercial interests of Mobile, to the duty of your great port in cooperating and rendering the necessary assistance in the development of the commerce of that great system of rivers, which has now been completed. Too often, if I might express the opinion, large ports and cities like yours have stressed the development of their ports and neglected features in the way of interior rivers, and certainly the time has now come when these interior rivers must be developed. Whatever they may need in the way of additional transportation lines or terminal facilities in the different towns and cities along that system of rivers the commercial people of Mobile, by reason of their superior knowledge on the subject, to say nothing perhaps of rendering some financial assistance, but largely in an educational way, can be instrumental in speeding up the commerce on that system of rivers. It is a very fine system, traverses a great section rich in productiveness, to say nothing of the coal and iron ore; and this committee—I think I speak for the committee—are exceedingly anxious to see that system, now that it is completed, justify the expenditure and help the cause of river and harbor improvements, which will serve as an example to other sections of the country and, in the meantime, it will afford additional commerce to this port of Mobile.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, to let you see how some of this very committee feel about this very project you are talking about, and just how interested we are in it, I will say that one member of our committee has gone to an executive session arranged by Senator Bankhead with the Shipping Board and Mr. McAdoo's department and the Fuel Administration this morning at 10 o'clock, and some of the rest of us are to give testimony in another way. Furthermore, I offered them absolutely free the use of a property I have for coal storage; and I believe that everyone in Mobile is intensely interested in this project and there is not anything that Mobile can do that it will not do to further that particular plan.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very fine spirit, and you should cooperate with the Federal Government in building and furnishing boats of a suitable type for that river.

Mr. Turner, may I say this, at this stage? What you gentlemen are primarily here asking for is an increased appropriation for the further improvement of the new project. Before the adoption of the project in the last river and harbor act, approved August 8, 1917, you had a project to be 30 feet over the bar, with a depth of 27 feet in the channel leading up to the city and Chickasaw Creek and 200 feet width. That project was adopted, and the last bill increased the depth over the bar to 33 feet, increased the depth in the channel of the bay and river up to the city to 30 feet, and widened the channel from 200 feet to 300 feet. The engineers have recommended for inclusion in this bill $160,000 for maintenance and $100,000 for the new project. You are seeking to have that recommendation of $100,000 increased to a substantial amount. Here is the situation which has confronted the committee. In estimates of appropriations for maintenance and for the further prosecution of projects which have been heretofore adopted we, with

scarcely any exception, have been controlled by the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. They base their recommendations of appropriations for the further prosecution of the projects heretofore adopted upon what they can profitably and wisely expend during the ensuing fiscal year. Now, they have only made the recommendation to which I referred. Mr. Gray, a member of this committee, a Representative from your State, has been insistently before the committee—I would not undertake to say how many times he has been before the committee—insisting that this appropriation of $100,000 is insufficient and ought to be increased. We all appreciate the importance of the port of Mobile. You have simply emphasized and brought up to date this morning the commercial activities there, which, in your opinion, not only justify the wisdom of Congress in adopting this new project, but, in your opinion, should hasten the completion of the project. I took the liberty of saying to Mr. Gray that I would go with him to the Chief of Engineers and discuss this matter with him, realizing, from my individual viewpoint as a member of the committee, that we must have some standard, and that, so far as I could foresee, the committee would be controlled by the recommendations as to what could be profitably expended. We had an interview with Col. Newcomer, who is the immediate representative of the Chief of Engineers for river and harbor improvements, the Chief of Engineers being largely engaged now in purely military matters, and we failed to make any impression. He said he would look into the matter further. I talked to him over the telephone yesterday afternoon, and he told me that he had had a talk with the Chief of Engineers upon the subject, and they did not feel that they could recommend an increased appropriation. I asked them then, over the telephone, as Mr. Gray and I did in person on the occasion of our visit, why, and he stated that it was proposed to do this by the Government plant of dredges; that the report which we adopted contemplated the construction of a new and suitable dredge for that locality to engage in this work; that it was not the policy of the War Department now to recommend the construction of dredges, owing to the difficulty of getting material, the difficulty of having them built, and the greater increased cost of construction of dredges; and that this was all the money that could be profitably used, plus the $160,000 for maintenance during the ensuing fiscal year with the Government plant which was available. We then asked him—and I repeated the question yesterday afternoon—why they could not enter into contracts and expend more money wisely and profitably. The reply was that it could be done much more completely by the Government plant; that it would be very much more expensive by contract; and that, in view of the greatly increased expense, plus the difficulty of finding contractors prepared to do the work, that they did not feel at liberty to recommend an increased appropriation based upon having the work done by contract.

Now, that is the situation up to date. You speak of the association of this project with the prosecution of the war. If you could by any means at your command bring about conditions which would induce the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War to recommend an increased appropriation, I think this committee would be very glad to recommend and include in the bill an increased ap-

propriation for Mobile Harbor. You spoke of the necessity of the large ships which are being built there by this Chickasaw shipbuilding plant, built under the general direction and supervision of the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation, and that they were large ships, and that they needed a larger channel. It may possibly be that an interview with the Shipping Board would induce the Shipping Board to take up this matter with the Secretary of War, and that would result in a recommendation to increase the appropriation. I mention this matter in order to put you in possession of the situation. This committee will be governed, and must be governed, I take it, by these recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as to what can be profitably expended during the next fiscal year. That is the rule applicable to every other river and harbor in the United States, which will be recognized in this bill by appropriations either for maintenance or for the further improvement of uncompleted projects. This committee, in their deliberations so far have not increased a single appropriation above the recommendation. They have under consideration eliminating one small one, but no increase so far. That is the situation which exists now. If you can bring about conditions which will induce the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to increase the recommendations, I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of the committee in stating that the committee will be very glad to receive any such recommendation, and may I say that this is in order to be perfectly frank about the matter.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, it almost seems an impossible task to send us back to them. I was in hopes that you were the supreme court, and not they; that they were only the court of appeals.

Mr. GRAY. You thought they were merely an advisory board; did you not?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. I thought so, too.

Mr. TURNER. Some gentlemen asked whether there was any place situated like Mobile—the same distance from the sea. I would like to answer that Mobile is from 32 to 33 miles from the sea, depending upon what point in the harbor you take. New Orleans is about five times that distance from the sea—one of the greatest ports in the country.

Mr. DUPRÉ. One hundred and ten miles.

Mr. TURNER. One hundred and ten miles—four times as far.

Mr. DUPRÉ. No; three and a half.

Mr. TURNER. Baltimore is a great distance from the sea, in just the same way. Savannah is about 26 miles, and Jacksonville the same way. The fact of it is that most of the big harbors are a long distance from the sea. If you compare us to New Orleans and Baltimore and some of these places, although we are a little distance from the Gulf, our two or three hours' steaming is practically nothing on the voyage.

There is one thing about this loading. One of the gentlemen made the remark about having to come into the Gulf to load, as against the north Atlantic ports. I would like to impress upon the men of this committee, because that is one of the important factors, that it takes six days' less running time from a north Atlantic port to Europe

than from a Gulf port to Europe. This time of six days is more than made up in dispatch we give the boats. I think you will find that the average loading time at north Atlantic ports is two weeks or more, which is not only due to cargo congestion but to labor conditions. Our average time in loading and dispatching boats last year was four days and a fraction. The American steamers that have come in for war munitions for France loaded in four days, so the six days on the ocean is more than made up by the decrease in the length of time it takes to load and dispatch the boats in the Gulf. We can get more cargo across in less time from the Gulf ports than from the north Atlantic ports.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if you care to go into that discussion at all, we have here Mr. A. G. Ward, the president of the State Harbor Commission of Alabama, and if you care to take up the question of port regulations he can tell you just what they have done and what they will do. If not, there is nothing Dr. Ward would care to say about that.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear from Mr. Ward.

STATEMENT OF MR. A. G. WARD, PRESIDENT STATE HARBOR COMMISSION OF ALABAMA, MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. WARD. Mr. President and gentlemen, in so far as the port regulations are concerned, that is given to the State harbor commission by the last legislature, and it regulates the charges and any rules or regulations that the State harbor commission may make in regard to the harbor. Now, we have from time to time made rules and regulations, always subject to the approval of the local United States engineer, and we have in almost every meeting had to establish new rules and regulations, such as the speed of boats, conforming to the United States harbor lines, and in the construction of ways and piers, and in all those improvements the United States engineers will not give a permit for those constructions until they have obtained the approval of the State harbor commission, and in every instance they submit the plans to us before they give the permit for the construction.

Now, I do not know whether there is anything else that I can say, except to say that we always cooperate with the United States engineers, and their recommendations in nearly every instance are carried out.

Mr. GRAY. May I suggest this: That in the last report of the United States engineer he states that that has not been done. Do you remember that?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean the annual report?

Mr. GRAY. Yes. Speaking of local cooperation, it says:

> The only condition imposed by law is that no work shall be done under an existing project until local interests have established port regulations satisfactory to the Secretary of War. This has not been complied with.

Mr. WARD. The State harbor commission has established those regulations, and they have in nearly every instance been approved by the United States engineers. We have submitted to the department, and they have been approved from time to time, any regulations that are even suggested by the local engineers.

Mr. BROOKS. You adopted two regulations just a few weeks ago, and made some new conditions?

Mr. WARD. Yes; as to speed of vessels in the river.

Mr. BROOKS. And you are working in full harmony now with the engineers?

Mr. WARD. Yes; and have always done so.

Mr. GRAY. It is perfectly satisfactory to them?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely. We cooperate with each other.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Your regulations and rules are reduced to typewritten and printed form?

Mr. WARD. They are.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And submitted in that form to the local engineers?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And they receive his approval?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. GRAY. Has he ever made any suggestion that you have not concurred in?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely has not ever made a suggestion since the passage of that law creating the State harbor commission.

Mr. DUPRÉ. When was that?

Mr. WARD. That was in 1915.

Mr. LEA. Your authority extends to municipalities as well as harbors elsewhere?

Mr. WARD. Yes, sir; its power extends to the Mobile River and its tributaries—Mobile Bay and all of the rivers that empty into Mobile Bay and as far up as the tide ebbs and flows down to and including Fort Morgan, Ala.

Mr. LEA. Any individual has the right to make complaint and bring it before you, has he?

Mr. WARD. Yes, sir; always.

Mr. LEA. Or you can initiate proceedings on your own account?

Mr. WARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEA. And guarantee equal conditions to shippers?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely. That is regulated by this board.

Mr. LEA. You have charge of the wharves as well as shippers?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely.

Mr. BROOKS. Are there any complaints going on there now that you know anything about?

Mr. WARD. Absolutely not as to rates or any charges. We have had different interests in Mobile send to us their wharfage and their rate of dockage and charges.

The CHAIRMAN. Has your commission jurisdiction over privately owned water terminals?

Mr. WARD. Yes, sir; it has.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Do you fix charges there?

Mr. WARD. We do, sir.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They are uniform?

Mr. WARD. Uniform.

Mr. GALLAGHER. At all of these terminals?

Mr. WARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to ask you gentlemen to hear Mr. A. J. Parsons, a manufacturer of our city, and one of our most patriotic citizens there. He is now doing work for the Government, but that

does not make him any less a good citizen. Mr. Parsons will speak of the manufacturing, and after he is through, if you will permit, I would like to say just a word in closing.

STATEMENT OF MR. A. J. PARSONS, MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. PARSONS. There was some talk a little while ago with regard to the increased cost of dredges. I am an iron manufacturer myself, and I have great doubt whether we shall ever return to prewar prices. My opinion is based on the idea that labor will always cost more than it has cost in the past, partly through the Government having increased railroad wages, which increase is likely to be used as a measure for other labor, and also the employment of Government labor in shipbuilding. Manufacturers find that once wages are raised, it takes a long while to get them back to a lower level, and I do not think you are ever likely to find the price of labor anything like what it was in the low period. Nor will the price of material, I think, ever go back quite as low. I am convinced it will ultimately go lower after the war than it is at present, but I do not think it will ever go back to the old low point. There has been so much material absolutely destroyed in this war that the supply is reduced. For instance, the ore that is nearest to hand has been in these times of high prices gotten out and removed rapidly and at any cost, and good ore in the future will necessarily cost more money. The same with coal. The coal that is nearest has been mined, and the coal that is farthest off will come later on and will cost more to get out, so that while it may be true that the cost of a dredge is $150,000 more to-day than was the case before the war, I do not think you will ever buy that dredge at the old price even after the war is over.

Mr. LEA. But how much would a dredger cost?

Mr. PARSONS. Four hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. LEA. At the present price?

Mr. PARSONS. The present estimated price.

Mr. LEA. What is the life of a dredger?

Mr. PARSONS. It depends a great deal on the character of work it does. Some classes of dredges last a great deal longer than others.

Mr. LEA. Ordinarily, though?

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, several years. I think the *Wahalak* was bought——

Mr. TURNER. This one they have in use now was bought nine years ago, and the upkeep on it will run higher and higher each year as it gradually wears out. No doubt a dredge would last a lifetime if you spent sufficient money on it to repair it, but after it is about 15 years old, of course, it would be out of date.

Mr. LEA. What kind of material is this to be dredged—loose material or hard?

Mr. PARSONS. Soft matter—black mud and sand.

Mr. TURNER. They have been using these dredges up in the shipbuilding plants, and I understand that the engineer is going to utilize one of them still further in shipbuilding work.

Mr. PARSONS. I may mention that I do not make dredges. I am not interested at all in the manufacture of dredges; I am just giv-

ing the committee, as far as I can, my humble opinion as an iron man, engaged in the iron industry.

The commerce of Mobile, the manufacturing industries of Mobile, engaged in shipping, have been very much increased in the past few years. Some of you gentlemen who were in Mobile have had the opportunity to personally investigate what has been done. For instance, the Chickasaw Shipbuilding Co. has bought 12,500 acres of land adjacent to the city of Mobile. It would only take 200 or 300 acres of land to do all the work and answer all the purposes of a shipbuilding plant. It is obvious, therefore, although we have no information on the subject, that the remaining 12,000 acres are to be employed in some large industrial enterprise. We do not think there is any doubt but that some day there will be steel manufactured there. The union of the ores of Chile and Cuba with the coal of the Warrior River probably will result in making iron in Mobile. It would be unnecessary to buy so large a tract of land for such purpose as building 10 ways for steamers, although that is a very large undertaking in itself. There are five other shipbuilding industries in Mobile to-day, one of which, the Alabama Dry Docks, is building two wooden cargo vessels and three mine sweepers, and also completing a wooden vessel of 500-tons capacity. In addition to that, the Alabama Dry Docks is repairing the ex-German steamer Lucile, a very large vessel, which you doubtless saw when you were in Mobile. The Mobile Shipbuilding Co. has a contract for 18 steel frame, wood-construction vessels, and the Murnon has a contract for 4.

Mr. GRAY. Where is their original home?

Mr. PARSONS. It is a Philadelphia concern. The Henderson Shipbuilding Co. is now building four submarine chasers. In fact, one of them has already been completed. The most complete and definite information as to the detailed plans of the Chickasaw Shipbuilding Co. is contained in the announcement of Mr. George Gordon Crawford, president of that company and of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., as follows:

It is proposed to begin construction immediately on a shipyard upon the land recently purchased north of Mobile. Ten shipways will be laid down, and wharves of suitable capacity for fitting out the ships will be built. A large power plant, boiler shop, plate and angle shop, machine shop, steel metal shop, joiner shop, forge shop, storehouse and main office will be constructed.

Two large villages have been laid out, one for white and the other for colored workmen. Both villages will have paved main streets and sidewalks, storm and sanitary sewers, a pure-water supply and street railway and electric-light service. About 1,600 houses of attractive appearance will be completed during the next 12 months. The health, safety, comfort, and recreation of the employees and their families will be considered in planning both the works and the villages.

For the purpose of supplying steel plates and shapes, suitable for building ships, the following construction is now under way at the general works: A 40-inch blooming mill; a 110-inch plate mill; a 26-inch shape mill; 600 houses for employees.

In addition there will be constructed at Fairfield the following plants for the manufacture of parts and machinery for ships:

A plate and angle shop, a forge shop, a foundry, a machine shop; 400 houses for employees.

To secure additional steel capacity, a third converter will be added to the converting mill at the Ensley works, and additional open hearth furnace will be added or larger size than the existing furnace.

Judge Gary has announced that the Mobile plant will specialize on the 9,600-ton vessel recommended by the United States Shipping Board.

Vessels of this size draw too much water to permit of being loaded to capacity at Mobile with the present depth of channel, and this will naturally suggest itself to you as an additional argument in favor of immediate action.

I forgot the most important thing. The United States Shipping Board, in conjunction with the Alabama Dry Dock Shipbuilding Co., is building a 10,000-ton dry dock in Mobile. This dock will be primarily at the disposition of the United States Government, and, of course, it stands to reason that they must think a great deal of Mobile and its possibilities, or they would not make that large investment. The dry dock will be a floating pontoon dry dock, with a lifting capacity of 10,000 tons. The length over all 485 feet, extreme beam 116 feet, width between side walls 90 feet. The dock is to be composed of two sections, each having five pontoons; each pontoon to be removable in such a manner that it can be docked and repaired. The dock can be operated either as a single dock of 10,000 tons or as two independent docks, which will lift a boat of approximately 4,000 tons each.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is that dry dock to be constructed, with reference to the city?

Mr. PARSONS. Right near the city.

The CHAIRMAN. Below or above?

Mr. TURNER. In the city, within the limits of the city.

Mr. PARSONS. Within the city limits, almost in front of the city wharf. We showed you where when you were down there. I thought that might be of considerable interest, as showing the confidence the authorities have in our port. We are also the principal repair port on the Gulf. We do an enormous repair business at Mobile, and have always been a great repair port. We think we are justified in asking for some acknowledgment of that as an industry, apart from the tonnage that passes through the port of Mobile. The repair of ships is a great, a gigantic industry in itself, and when you consider the large number of men employed in it, I think it will appeal to you as being worthy of some consideration. I thank you very much, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF MR. STEWART BROOKS, VICE CHAIRMAN JOINT RIVERS AND HARBOR COMMITTEE, MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much gratified at the frank and confidential treatment that you gentlemen have given us, and I would like to say two or three things on little points that need attention, that came up during the statements of the gentlemen that I have asked the committee to hear.

Mr. Turner has given you a very fair statement about that dredge proposition, and those things look to me like the very vital things we have got to contend with. Engineers are technical men, and, naturally, they love a beautiful machine, and, temperamentally, they are just bent on applying this principle by building a beautiful, modern dredge and its equipment. I wish we could have it, but if

they undertake to build one for us now there will be some funerals in our town before we ever get the work started. Now, if we could get the engineers to lay aside in the present emergency their preference for building dredges, and go out and purchase, not ideal dredges, but one or more of the best dredges that can be had, they would get us past this emergency. The very fact that the engineers are more and more doing their own dredging is more and more putting out of business the contract dredger, and the consequence is that if the engineers were to go out and pick up dredges—they might not be entirely satisfactory to the engineers, but they would do the work in a comparatively short time. The practical shipping interests of the country have been going out on the islands in the Gulf and hauling off wrecks that have been there for years and not considered worth pulling off, and remodeling them into emergency steamships for present use. It would not have paid four years ago, but it does pay now. I can take you gentlemen to my office window and show you 10 ways which are at present completed, and wooden steamships that are being built thereon; a thing they would not have thought of a few years ago. Now, if we can get the gentlemen of the Board of Engineers to do likewise in this emergency and forego the building of a beautiful, thoroughly modern dredge and buy or rent at once some of the dredges that can be had, it will help us very much. That is a point that is hard to go up against, but that is a thing we would like to have very much.

Now, there is another matter about the Warrior River improvement that has been suggested by some remarks made by members of your committee. I do not know that we ought to undertake to say in advance what a witness before another body is going to testify to, but I had a very full talk coming up on the train with one of our members, who went by invitation before the Fuel Administration to-day, as to what he was going to say about this improvement on the Warrior River and about using the Warrior River. This man has been one of the leading coal merchants of the South for years—bunker coal and domestic coal—and he is an expert on the subject, and has been closely allied with the L. & N. road, which for years was supposed to be inimical to water improvement down there, and yet to-day he is in line with the policy of barging the coal down the river. He told me on the train coming up here yesterday that he was going to state before the Fuel Administration that, in his opinion, the river, as now improved, was practically a railroad without equipment, and that for success to be had in the traffic on the river the Government or some very large concern would have to take the problem and handle it comprehensively, would have to take the problem as a mining problem, a carriage-to-the-river problem, a carriage-down-the-river problem, a loading-on-the-ship problem, and a marketing problem all in one. In other words, it is one big, broad, comprehensive problem, and he is to-day somewhere in this city giving the advice to the Fuel Administration that somebody has got to take that handling up as a big problem, one comprehensive problem, with enough authority and enough money to make it go. That is a feature of the problem.

Now, there is one other matter. The chairman asked a while ago about the publicly owned terminals. Mr. Turner was asked about

that, but I think he missed telling a little more about the $600,000 municipal improvement, bids for which will be opened, I think, on the 20th of this month. That is no chimera. The bonds have been sold, and the money is lying there in the Mobile banks subject to check of the city commission. That improvement is one the primary feature of which is a wharf 8,000 feet long, which will accommodate, when completed, 18 steamships 400 feet in length. It will have a magnificent turning basin inside of it. It is immediately below the city, within the city limits. It will connect by its own tracks directly with the L. & N. Railroad tracks, and the Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad, and with the Mobile & Ohio Railroad, our great traffic feeder track to the west, and by the Mobile & Ohio Railroad, with which is allied the Southern Railroad, which comes into the northern part of the city. There will be connections with every railroad in town, except the Alabama, Tennessee & Northern road, which has no line into Mobile yet. It looks as if that one terminal will absolutely solve the question. The amount of berthing space there will for many years to come absolutely kill the chance of anything like throttling competition by private interests, to say nothing of the big municipal shed you gentlemen saw, that big steel shed along the main front, which will berth four big steamships at one time. That shed is 100 feet wide and 1,500 feet long. So that I am pleased to tell you gentlemen that the city of Mobile is in the saddle and has its hands on the reins, and there can be no throttling of competition in port facilities at Mobile for many years to come. We are safe on that, and I believe I am safe in telling you so.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very fine statement.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Dupré, Mr. Switzer, and one other gentleman, possibly, asked a few questions about this United States Steel Corporation shipbuilding plant. You gentlemen who were down there saw what they have done. For those of you who were not there, the little black lines down here on this map mean the city of Mobile, and the big black lines indicate the area that the United States Steel Corporation occupies. That territory up there is equal to 20 square miles of territory, and the United States Steel Corporation holds a fee-simple title to every foot of it. I show you gentlemen that just as an indication that these people mean to do tremendous things.

One of the members of the committee asked what will become of the 10,000-ton ships which will be launched at this great shipbuilding yard. These ships when launched will put in enough freight to ballast them, and then we will have to let them go to some other port to take on the balance of their cargoes.

May I add just one word about tonnage, our particular problem. I do not know how many projects you have got, but let me show you the difference between 27 feet and a little more than 27 feet. We are right on that line where it just simply plays havoc with us. You heard mention of the larger boats of the Leyland Line. The Leyland Line has two classes of boats known as the M class and the N class. Class M boats, like the Memphian, can just come in and out, loaded to their plimsoll marks. The large boats of the Leyland Line, N class boats, like the Nitonian, can not come in there and go out fully loaded, and the consequence is that they have got to be very careful what they put in that boat. The larger boats just simply

have to go out partly empty. It is the difference between 27 feet and 30 feet. The big port of Mobile is required to use a smaller and less economical boat, because of a lack of a few feet of depth, as we can not send the larger boats down our channel, and yet these little ports, with only a fraction of our tonnage, have the more adequate facilities of greater depth.

I do not want to take any more of your time. I think our committee has made such an excellent presentation that I would mar it if I said more. I thank you for your attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The delegation has made a very fine presentation. We are very glad to have heard from you.

(Whereupon the committee adjourned.)

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 119 657 497

DATE DUE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004